

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

PAUL A. GREEN,

§

Plaintiff,

§
§
§
§

v.

§
§
§
§

**COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,**

§
§
§
§

Defendant.

§
§

Case No. 6:19-CV-398-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Paul Green filed the above-styled and numbered lawsuit for the denial of social security benefits. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On January 13, 2020, Judge Love issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 11), recommending that this civil action be dismissed without prejudice as untimely. *Id.* at 2–3.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge *de novo* only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a *de novo* review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Plaintiff did not file objections in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. See *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*,

492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 11) as the findings of this Court.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report (Docket No. 11) be **ADOPTED**. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **30th** day of **January, 2020**.



JEREMY D. KERNODEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE